

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2005/090
Manuscript title: Buried alive: The presence of nursing on hospital Web sites
Manuscript type: Regular
Number of text pgs.: 14
Number of figures: 0
Number of tables: 3
Reviewer: Gwen G. Morse
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer? NO

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: 2
Attention to relevant literature: 1
Theoretical framework: N/A
Research design: 2
Data analysis: 2
Discussion of results: 2
Organization: 2
Writing style: 1

Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):

Value of topic: 4
Probable reader interest in topic: 4
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 5
Priority of topic for publication: 4
Rank this manuscript for its value: 3

Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions
Maybe accept with revisions X
Do not accept

Comments for Editor only:

**Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.
Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.**

Buried alive: The presence of nursing on hospital Web sites - 2005/090

This study provides the reader an interesting perspective regarding the lack of nursing presence on hospital web sites. Besides the potential for recruitment the authors pose that nursing's contributions to the various organizations needs to be displayed. Follows are suggestions the author(s) may consider to further develop this manuscript.

Problem Statement:

The author(s) do not have a specific problem statement but instead pose the following research questions: (a) what proportion of a sample of U.S. hospital Web sites has a presence of nursing? (b) what is the accessibility of the *presence of nursing* on a sample of U.S. hospital Web sites? And (c) what are the characteristics of the *presence of nursing* on a sample of U.S. hospital web sites?

The *presence of nursing* is clearly defined prior to the research questions as "accessibility of data about nurses, nursing practice, or nursing care". The author(s) may want to instead write a problem statement that is less "wordy" such as:

The purpose of this study is to explore the *presence of nursing* from a random sample of U.S. hospital Web sites for the following characteristics:

- 1) proportion
- 2) accessibility
- 3) characteristics

Then focus on these 3 areas throughout the manuscript.

Literature Review:

There is no separate literature review section in this paper. In its place, the "background" section provides supportive literature to support the research variables. The author(s) may want to consider separate level headings with each of the variables noted above and discussed respectively. For example, the discussion of physician's presence could be discussed under "proportion". Accessibility should be defined early on as to what this means and a historical perspective presented (i.e., hospital web sites). Introduction of characteristic early in the manuscript would also be of benefit to the reader.

Also the author(s) should clearly note throughout this discussion that the focus is on hospital web sites (to avoid confusion regarding .gov and .edu sites). For example, on line 17 (p.5), the discussion of omission of positive images of nursing on the "Web" implies all areas whereas, this is not the case. There are outstanding .gov and .edu sites but these do not have the clinical focus that the author(s) appear to be focused on.

Theoretical Framework: None

Style of Presentation: The writing style is clear and appropriate.

Research Design

- The author(s) note this as a descriptive study on p. 6, whereas, this appears to be exploratory descriptive design.
- Sample: Provide more information about the randomization procedure used.
- Instruments: The author(s) developed a new instrument for this study entitled "Presence of Nursing: Hospital Web Site Checklist".
 - More information regarding the development of the tool is needed. The author(s) note *in-depth* preliminary work but this is not explained. Also, provide more description regarding the research team (i.e. are these doctorally prepared). How did the team determine the list of characteristics? It appears that the attempt to

refine this list served as a pilot study? May help to discuss the psychometrics of the instrument and include a discussion of reliability/validity testing.

- In the next paragraph, it is noted that the final list of 75 characteristics was reduced to five categories. What was this based on? The categories are explained, but need more depth (examples of characteristics). Finally, Table One should include all items in the categories, not just a brief example of each. Inclusion of the instrument would be of benefit.
 - The rating scale is unclear. From the description it appears to be a Likert style and implies evaluation of each characteristic. However, this seems to be a tally of the categories and needs to be discussed as frequency data. My guess is that data collectors marked whether the characteristic was present or not (binary data)? Then accumulated for the scale noted?
 - The accessibility section needs further development. The author(s) define accessibility as “number of layers” which is unclear. It appears to be that they author(s) are discussing “breadcrumbs” and web navigation. Here is a helpful URL: <http://www.webdesignpractices.com/navigation/breadcrumb.html> Using standard web terminology will provide more clarity for the reader(s). Layers are described in context as a method of web design that provides the designer more flexibility and control over the placement of objects on a single web page.
- Data Collection: Is the refinement of the instrument (p. 7, line 7) the same as the discussion of evaluation of 5 web sites on p. 8? Were both sets from the original 50?

Data Analysis

- Findings: More information regarding the hospitals evaluated needed. Consider inclusion of bed size, for profit or non-profit, etc. This information as well as geographic breakdown would be best represented in a table and summarized in the text. The finding that 94% are academic institutions needs to be further discussed (seems to have potential bias for the findings). Does this include nursing schools? If so, graduate, doctoral, etc. would be of benefit for the reader.
- The authors may find that use of level headings with the study variables would be of great assistance. Then discuss the specific findings for these areas. The characteristics section needs more description. The summation does not provide information without reference to a table. What are these characteristics? Possibly a table that shows specific frequencies for each characteristic may be of benefit.
- Most important by discussing each variable and reporting analysis related to these will provide much needed clarity. Also inclusion of the characteristics broken down by category is necessary.

Organization

- The manuscript needs revised organization as discussed in the various sections above.